

REMARKS

Claims 20 - 40 are currently pending. Of these, Claims 20, 29, 38, and 39 are the independent claims. Claims 1-19 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claims 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, based on prior amendments to claims 23, 24, and 32 adding the term "comprising." All objections to the drawings, the specification, and the claims have been withdrawn, for which Applicant is very grateful. Also, claims 20-22, 25, 26, 28-31, 34, 35, and 37-40 are indicated as allowable. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for this action as well.

Although Applicant is not in full agreement with the Examiner's reasoning for the new section 112 rejections, Applicant has replaced the term of art transition "comprises" in dependent Claims 23 and 32 (meaning, *inter alia*, "having at least") with a Markush transition according to accepted practice and to advance prosecution. The transition "comprises" in independent claims 24 and 33 designating aluminum chloride and iron (III) chloride, respectively as preferred Lewis acids is replaced with the term "is." This again is accepted practice in American patent law.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position on Claims 27 and 36. It is accepted claim practice to state that a claimed reagent for use in an ammonolysis step "comprises" a particular material, in this case an aqueous solution of ammonia. Applicant is entitled to specify that the reagent used in this step "includes at least" an aqueous solution containing ammonia.¹ Nothing in the specification indicates that use of aqueous ammonia alone or by itself is critical in the practice of the inventive process, and Applicant should not be required to close this claim to specify use of only aqueous ammonia in this step of the process.

No new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein, which are

¹The generally accepted meaning of the patent claim transitional term of art "comprises" or "comprising" is "having or containing at least" thus and such.

Application No. 10/584,369
January 21, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

supported by the disclosure of the original claims and the specification.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, that all objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that a Notice of Allowance be issued at the earliest possible convenience.

In the event this response is not timely filed, Applicant hereby petitions for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper be charged to our Deposit Account No. 12-2355.

Respectfully submitted.

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: /Mark S. Graham/

Mark S. Graham

Registration No. 32,355

MSG:MER:lal

Date: January 21, 2009
P.O. Box 1871
Knoxville, Tennessee 37901
(865) 546-4305

E-Filing